

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/706,124	11/12/2003	Kaoru Okumura	M61.12-0548	6217		
27366 WESTMAN (7590 11/06/200 CHAMPLIN (MICROSO	EXAM	EXAMINER			
SUITE 1400			LOVEL, KI	LOVEL, KIMBERLY M		
	AVENUE SOUTH IS, MN 55402-3244	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
			2167			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			11/06/2008	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/706,124	OKUMURA, KAORU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KIMBERLY LOVEL	2167	

	KIMBERLY LOVEL	2167	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 23 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		26(a) and the appropriat	o ovtonoion foo
Extensions of linite in tay be duranted united 37 CFR. 1.30(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR. 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any semend patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR. 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp.	liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be	filed within two months	of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t 			cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor		ΓE below);	
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet 		tuoina or eimplifuina ti	on incurse for
appeal; and/or			ie issues ioi
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number or finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (DTOL-324)
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		Inpliant Americanient (102-324).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)		I be entered and an e	xplanation of
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	ided below or appended.		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3.6-8.10.20.21.24-26</u> and <u>28</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	it or other evidence is	necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
13. Other:			
/John R. Cottingham/			

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The Amendment which amends claims 1, 20 and 26 has been entered. Each of the independent claims has been amended in the following manner: Claim I has been amended to include the limitations of dependent claims 4 and 5; Claims 4; Cla

Referring to Applicant's arguments on page 6 of the Remarks, the applicant states "There is nothing in the Mackie reference that proposes concatenation for any purpose related to query processing." The examiner respectfully disagrees. Mackie Mackies with the processing of Natural Language input. Natural Language input is considered to meet the requirements of the term guery, when the term query is given the broadest reasonable interventation according to one of ordinary skill in the art since the term is equivalent on query.

On page 6 of the Remarks, the applicant also argues "The statement noted by the Examiner supports a motivation to undo concatenation, which is the focus of the Mackite reference. Applicant's claims have to do with the utilization of concatenation to create as many new words as possible, which certainly would not reduce the size of the dictionary base." The examiner respectfully disagrees that the formation of words through concatenation would not reduce the size of a dictionary base. The applicant is creating words upon concatenation would not reduce the size of a dictionary base. The applicant is creating words upon concatenation in order to create additional words at the time the search is performed. These words that are created at runtime are not stored. Therefore, since these additional words are not stored, the size of the dictionary does not increase.

The rejections of the dependent claims are maintained for the reasons stated above in regards to the independent claims.